

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Federal-State Joint Board on) CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service)

**Comments of the New Mexico State Corporation Commission in Support of the
Petitions for Reconsideration by the Wyoming Public Service Commission, the
Vermont Public Service Board, and the Alaska Public Utilities Commission**

The New Mexico State Corporation Commission ("Commission") respectfully submits comments in support of certain positions taken in the Petition for Reconsideration of the Wyoming Public Service Commission (WPSC), the Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification of the Vermont Public Service Board and the Vermont Department of Public Service (VPSB), and the Petition for Reconsideration and Request for Clarification of the Alaska Public Utilities Commission (APUC). The Commission is the telecommunications regulatory body in the state of New Mexico.

The Commission expresses its strong support for the positions taken by WPSC, VPSB, and APUC that the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC's") order mandating that the federal Universal Service Fund (USF) support only 25% of a state's rural high-cost need will create seriously adverse consequences to states that are not densely populated and will violate both the spirit and the letter of the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). WPSC Petition at 2-4; VPSB Petition at 2-6; APUC Petition at 5-9.

**Percentage of Federal USF Support for High-Cost Services
Should Be Significantly Greater Than 25%**

According to Attachment A of the VPSB Petition, the Commission would have to impose a surcharge of approximately 26% (even more than what Vermont would have to impose) in order to make up for the USF revenue lost under the FCC's rule that provides for only 25% support for high-cost need from the USF. That would amount to a 26% rate increase for basic local exchange service throughout New Mexico on top of any increase that may result from a successful attempt by a local exchange company to "rebalance" residential and business rates.

Such a consequence would be especially severe in New Mexico, which is one of the poorest states in the country and which has a significantly lower subscriber rate than the national average. This consequence would be totally contrary to the mandate of the Act to "preserve and advance universal service." Indeed, the FCC's order to allocate only 25% of the high-cost need to the federal USF would result in not only a failure to advance universal service, but also a failure to preserve universal service. If states without the resources to do so are charged with the greatest burden of ensuring the preservation and advancement of universal service, the movement toward universal service will take a giant step backwards. Furthermore, given the renewed vitality of the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, see Printz v. United States, Supreme Court case No. 95-1503 (June 27, 1997), there is a decreasing likelihood that Congress or the FCC will be

able to require the states to ensure the preservation of universal service by subsidizing universal service with general state revenue.¹

In addition to violating the Act, the FCC's mandate regarding the allocation of the high-cost need runs contrary to a policy statement in the FCC's Report and Order in this docket: that the FCC wants to "avoid action that directly or indirectly raises the price of the basic residential telephone service that guarantees access to the local exchange network." Report and Order, para. 16. Clearly, a significant rate increase in basic local telephone service would jeopardize the already-tenuous affordability of that service.

The FCC correctly observes that "in light of the significant disparity of income levels throughout the country, per-capita income of a local or regional area, and not a national median, should be considered in determining affordability." *Id.*, para. 115. Therefore, even if basic telephone service is generally affordable today, see id., para. 2, it may not be generally affordable in relatively poor, largely rural states such as New Mexico. Under a 25%-allocation regime, in comparison with the much greater federal USF allocation for many rural areas under the current regime, local basic telephone service will only become less affordable to many residential consumers. The Commission, therefore, agrees with WPSC, VPSB, and APUC that the mechanism established by the FCC to support universal service, even when taken together with possible state mechanisms (over which the FCC probably has no control), would provide insufficient support in violation of Section 254(b)(5) of the Act. See WPSC Petition at 2; VPBS Petition at 3; APUC Petition at 6, 8.

¹ Printz stands for the principle that an unfunded federal mandate to state officials to implement a federal regulatory program is unconstitutional, unless the federal government is prepared to preempt the states'


The Commission also agrees with WPSC that the FCC's new mandate for the federal USF violates Section 254(b)(3). See id. If, under the new regime, the rates in rural New Mexico for basic local exchange service remain "reasonably comparable to rates charged for similar services in urban areas" in New Mexico, Section 254(b)(3), as pointed out above, those rates will not be reasonably comparable to those charged in urban (or rural) areas in the more densely populated states. Because the comparability of rates is to apply to "[c]onsumers in all regions of the Nation", id. (emphasis added), and given the spirit of the Act and the spirit of Section 254 in particular, Congress could not have intended that the comparability of rates between rural and urban areas is to be achieved only within any given state.

As VPBS argues at page 4 of its Petition, even though the FCC has reserved the right to modify the 25% allocator, 25% "is simply not the right starting point." Therefore, the Commission supports the requests of WPSC, VPBS, and APUC that the FCC reconsider its Order with regard to this matter.

WHEREFORE, the New Mexico State Corporation Commission submits these comments for the FCC's consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

New Mexico State Corporation Commission



David M. Kaufman, General Counsel
New Mexico State Corporation Commission
Assistant Attorney General
P.O. Drawer 1508
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1508
(505) 827-6074

role and implement the program directly. Id.

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Comments of the New Mexico State Corporation Commission in Support of the Petitions for Reconsideration by the Wyoming Public Service Commission, the Vermont Public Service Board, and the Alaska Public Utilities Commission was mailed by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to each of the following individuals on this 14th day of August 1997.

William F. Caton*
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Elisabeth H. Ross
Birch, Horton, Bittner and Cherot
1155 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036-4308

Sheryl Todd*
Universal Service Branch
Accounting and Audits Division
Common Carrier Bureau
2100 M Street, N.W. 8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20554

Alyce A. Hanley, Acting Chairman
Alaska Public Utilities Commission
1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 300
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Office of General Counsel*
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W. Room 614
Washington, D.C. 20554

Carrol S. Verosky
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002



David M. Kaufman, General Counsel
New Mexico State Corporation Commission

*Indicates delivery by express mail